

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL
FACILITIES FOR VARIOUS GOV-
ERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, about
a year ago I served on a subcommittee
of the Committee on Armed Services
which recommended an authorization for
a new building for the Central Intelli-
gence Agency, at an authorized cost of

1956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9795

\$46 million. I was partly instrumental in convincing some of the other members of that committee, as well as the Appropriations Committee, of the need for such a building. Even though the figure seemed a little high, I thought it was justified. I was influenced partly by the fact that thereby the Federal Government would be enabled to vacate some of the temporary buildings on or near Constitution Avenue.

I agreed to that figure also in part because of special storage requirements for this particular agency.

There is also provision for an authorization of \$8,500,000 to extend the approaches of the George Washington Memorial Highway if the building in question is to be located in Langley, Va. I thought that appropriation would serve a double purpose. It would facilitate extension of the memorial highway as early as possible, and it would also serve the proposed building.

I shall not give the figures as to the number of employees which this Agency has accumulated since it was created in 1947, because of certain security considerations involved in the number of employees. But to me the number was shocking, and it was shocking to many others who heard the proof.

In the face of those facts, I am further shocked and somewhat chagrined to learn that the CIA is asking for an additional \$10 million for the construction of this building, over and above the \$46 million already authorized.

The press has already dubbed the proposed building as a "little Pentagon." I was not in sympathy with that designation when it was coined, but later I concluded that the press was perhaps as nearly right as I was, even though I had more of the facts than the press had.

I feel a certain sense of responsibility in this connection, toward the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as to the members of the Appropriations Committee, because of representations which I made to them last year. Unless the facts have materially changed, I shall certainly vigorously oppose an increase of \$10 million for this building. The only justification given for this item is that building costs have gone up 5 7/8 percent within the past 12 months. However, the increase in the request for appropriations is 21.7 percent.

Without going into this subject further at this time, or making an extended argument, I announce that I shall certainly look into the question further, and I expect to oppose the proposal. I strongly favor the construction of ornamental buildings on Constitution Avenue, Capitol Hill, or other similar areas of the Federal Government. Such structures should not be built primarily with the idea of trying to save a dollar, because when we ornament the Hill, it is an ornament to the entire Nation.

However, the proposed construction is away from the Hill, away from the immediate seat of government. I consider the proposed expenditure to be lavish. I think it illustrates the point that at some time the Congress must call a halt on lavish expenditures for public build-

ings. Otherwise we may make ourselves the laughing stock of those who know the facts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know what the Senator from Mississippi is talking about. The construction of every building of this type must be approved by the Committee on Public Works.

I have found, through representations which have been made before the Committee on Public Works, that every agency of the Federal Government located within the District of Columbia has the bright idea that Congress will approve the selection of an area which suits the esthetic ideas of the personnel of the particular agency.

The CIA is not the only agency involved. There is before the Committee on Public Works for approval a great scheme of the Geological Survey. Notwithstanding the fact that there is plenty of Federal property within the District that is vacant, the Geological Survey wants to go elsewhere, not for the purpose of more efficiency, but to suit the ideas of the personnel within the agency.

I think every Member who is listening to me now is familiar with the area of the Bureau of Standards, on Connecticut Avenue. There is no better location in the District of Columbia. Nevertheless, the Bureau wants to give it up and move to a new location, where it can have more lawns, more of this, and more of that.

The Committee on Public Works is asking all the agencies to furnish it with a list of the vacant property which they now have in the District of Columbia. I know it is the feeling of the Congress, and, I think, it is the desire of the people of the United States that all the temporary buildings on the Mall, on Constitution Avenue, and elsewhere, should be eliminated. Would the Congress be justified in buying property for the Geological Survey or for the Bureau of Standards or for the CIA so long as it has property which it already owns? I do not think the Congress would be justified in spending millions of dollars for new real estate.

Let me give the Senate another example. The property across from the White House, at 17th Street, is occupied, I believe, by the Court of Claims. Do the Senators know who owns that property? It, and also the parking lot next to it, is owned by Uncle Sam. Someone is making money by having a parking lot there. Apparently all the members of the court wish to have a building in the country, with the exception of Judge Marvin Jones. Would we be justified in abandoning that property? For what would it be used? If we should abandon it we would have to justify before our constituents and the American people why we did that and then appropriate millions of dollars to buy land on the outskirts of the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is not represented in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. The responsibility for the welfare of the District of Columbia is in the Congress of the United States. Do we not have a responsibility, even from an economic standpoint, to consider these things before we take hasty action?

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, before the CIA and other Government agencies receive any more money from the Committee on Public Works they will have to make a better showing than they have made up to this moment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I expect to be absent from the Senate the latter part of this week and during next week. It is hoped by the leadership that the Senate will be able to conclude action on the defense appropriation bill today and proceed to the consideration of the mutual security authorization bill. We shall, of course, consider any conference reports which may be available, and it may be that